

**Judiciary Response  
To the Department of Legislative Services  
Recommendations for  
Judiciary – District Court Issues**

**Rockville District Court**

The Judiciary concurs with the budget analyst recommendation to approve the detailed planning funds for the Rockville District Court.

The Judiciary is hereby including the DGS response to address the analyst's comments about the usual scope of design services and the use of a commissioning agent.

**Centreville District Court**

While the analyst is correct that "it is unlikely that Queen Anne's County will get an additional District Court judge in the near future," the Judiciary has none the less found creative ways to address and manage the case backlog.

We have actually been utilizing a second courtroom for almost two years now. In July 2002, the Judiciary established a second District Court courtroom in the Queen Anne County Commissioner's Hearing room. We used this room once a week to reduce existing backlogs.

Recently, the Judiciary was able to relocate from the County Commissioner Hearing room to a small room in the Circuit Courthouse. We have a second courtroom operating there one day a week and could do more if staffing permitted. We use this second courtroom for civil cases and domestic violence cases, and utilize an existing judge within the District to assist, and because we are able to creatively reassign an existing judge within the District, we have not requested an additional judgeship certification.

The problem remains, that the Judiciary can assign a judge, but needs a courtroom in which to hold the cases.

We are requesting this renovation funding now, because DSS is vacating the building as they have outgrown their space and this provides the opportune time for us to add the much needed courtroom, improve public safety by enlarging the lobby to permit the adequate use of metal detectors, and steam line the clerk's area to provide improved citizen access and information.

The existing Centreville District Court building was constructed in 1982 and, in no way, addresses the current needs of the Judiciary.

The Judiciary is hereby including the DGS response to the analyst's recommended reductions.

**Department of General Services Response to  
Department of Legislative Services Recommendations  
For Judiciary - District Court Issues**

**Rockville District Court**

The Department of General Services concurs with the budget analyst recommendation to approve the detailed planning funds for the Rockville District Court. However, we do take exception to the comment that states that \$966,769 or approximately 1.8 %, for telecommunications and security design, is not included in the *usual* scope of design services. The appropriate way to address this would be to indicate that these types of design services are not part of our *basic* design fee, which typically includes five (5) essential design disciplines: Architect, Structural Engineer, Mechanical Engineer, Electrical Engineer and Civil Engineer.

We also take exception to the comment that states while the A/E design team should be held accountable that the systems installed and are operating properly, past experience has indicated that frequently A/E firms do not have the technical expertise to do this, and training personnel in how to operate the systems is beyond the scope of the basic A/E contract.

We believe that it is in the best interest of the State to contract with a separate commissioning agent to ensure that the type of substantive mechanical and electrical systems, intended to support this major structure, are designed, constructed and operated at the most efficient and cost effective levels.

**Centreville District Court**

The Department of General Services disagrees with the recommendation to reduce the request by \$94,000 for planning and design. The issue raised by the analyst states that the need for additional architectural/engineering fees of \$64,251 does not make sense for this project and that that extra design fees to cover telecommunications and security are not deemed to be a significant factor here since the Centreville project is an existing one room courthouse. Whether the project is a new courthouse or a renovated one, there are still certain requirements in the design process to support the programmatic functions of a court facility. The previous use of the space, where the court is planning on expanding into, was for general office functions and had very general telecommunication and security requirements. The District Court program justifiable needs for enhanced security and telecommunication milestones are significantly more sophisticated. This is the reason for including a reasonable design allowance for these services.

The analyst also suggests that the cost of \$30,000 for critical path management is not needed. Critical Path Method (CPM) scheduling is a tool that we have used on numerous projects to ensure that the construction schedule, as prepared by the contractor, is adhered to throughout the construction duration. In addition, this estimated cost is calculated on the DGS Cost Estimate Worksheet (CEW) as part of the construction estimate, not the design estimate. To remove \$30,000 from the recommended design funds would further deter our ability to hire a qualified design firm at a reasonable, market based price.